

**WAUKESHA COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
SUMMARY OF MEETING**

The following is a Summary of the Board of Adjustment Meeting held on Wednesday, October 14, 2009, at 6:30 p.m. in Room AC 255/259 of the Waukesha County Administration Center, 515 W. Moreland Blvd., Waukesha County, Wisconsin, 53188.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Ray Dwyer
Robert Bartholomew
Walter Schmidt
Nancy Bonniwell
Linda Weber

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Tom Day

SECRETARY TO THE BOARD: Nancy M. Bonniwell

OTHERS PRESENT: Town of Merton Board of Adjustment
Peggy Tilley, Senior Land Use Specialist
David & Anne Anschuetz, BA09:038, owners
Deron Butler, BA09:038, agent
Kathy Gutenkunst, BA09:032, attorney for owner
John Hazod, BA09:041, agent
Josef & Katharina Hazod, BA09:041, owners
Bill & Beth Durkin, BA09:042, owners
Ulrich Falatyk, BA09:037, owner
Joseph George, BA09:038, neighbor
Dennis Kukla, BA09:038, neighbor
Charlotte Thomas, BA09:039, neighbor
Amy Thomas, BA09:039, owner
Jeff Bertelson, BA09:032, owner
Jim Wozniak, BA09:037, architect
Fred Russell, BA09:041, neighbor
Thomas & Mary Kiehl, BA09:042, neighbors

The following is a record of the motions and decisions made by the Board of Adjustment. Detailed minutes of these proceedings are not produced, however, a taped record of the meeting is kept on file in the office of the Waukesha County Department of Parks and Land Use and a taped copy is available, at cost, upon request.

SUMMARIES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

Mr. Bartholomew *I make a motion to approve the Summary of the Meeting of September 9, 2009.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Dwyer and carried with four yes votes. Ms. Weber abstained from voting, as she was not in attendance at the September 9, 2009 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

BA09:032 ANNETTE AND JEFF BERTELSON:

Ms. Bonniwell

*I make a motion to **approve** the request for an after-the-fact variance from the remodeling a non-conforming structure in excess of 50% of its fair market value requirements of the Ordinance to allow the after-the-fact remodeling of the accessory structure near the lake subject to the following condition:*

- 1. The garage-type doors on the east side of the structure must be relocated to the lakeside of the structure.*

Restoring the garage-type doors to the lakeside of the structure will make the accessory structure more conforming in that it will once again be a boathouse as defined in the Ordinance.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bartholomew and carried with three yes votes. Mr. Schmidt and Ms. Weber abstained from voting as they were not in attendance at a previous variance request on the subject property where discussion occurred regarding the accessory structure in question.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff's recommendation was for **denial** of the request for a variance from the remodeling a non-conforming structure in excess of 50% of its fair market value to allow the after-the-fact remodeling of the accessory building near the lake on the subject property.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

It has not been demonstrated, as required for a variance, that denial of the requested variances would result in an unnecessary hardship. A hardship has been defined by the Wisconsin Supreme Court as a situation where compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. The property is currently being used for a permitted purpose and could continue to be if the accessory structure near the lake were removed. There are several other detached accessory buildings on the property that may be used for storage space.

Furthermore, the structure is extremely non-conforming in that it does not meet the offset and the shore setback requirements of the Ordinance. It should be noted that if garage type doors were installed on the lakeside of the structure, it would be considered a boathouse but it would still be non-conforming with respect to offset and with respect to the number of accessory structures on the lot. Approving the requested variance would will prolong the life of severely non-conforming structure. Alternatively, the staff feels that the structure should be removed and the area restored with natural vegetation. Any claim of hardship by the owner in this case is self-created because the work was completed without the necessary

permits. Therefore, the approval of this request would not be within the purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

BA09:039 AMY E. THOMAS:

Mr. Schmidt

*I make a motion to **approve** the request, in accordance with the Staff's recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report and for the reasons stated in the Staff Report.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bartholomew and carried unanimously.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff's recommendation was for **approval** of the request for a variance from the road setback requirements of the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance for the porch on the property to be rebuilt and slightly enlarged, subject to the following conditions:

1. A detailed cost estimate for the proposed construction shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit.
2. The porch shall be no deeper than the existing porch.
3. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, an updated Plat of Survey showing all existing structures and the location of the proposed porch, in conformance with the above conditions, must be prepared by a registered land surveyor and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

The proposed porch will not extend any further from the residence than the existing porch and will be set back further from the road right-of-way than the attached garage. There are a significant number of trees between the road and the proposed porch addition limiting any visual impact on the road. Additionally, there are a number of structures on nearby properties that are located closer to the road right-of-way than the proposed porch. The existing residence is in the most appropriate location on the property and to require that the residence be slightly relocated rather than to allow a small road setback variance for the existing porch to be rebuilt and laterally enlarged would be unnecessarily burdensome on the property owner. Therefore, the approval of this request would be within the purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

BA09:037 ULRICH FALATYK:

Mr. Schmidt

*I make a motion to **deny** the request for a variance from the building height provisions of the Waukesha County Zoning Code but **approve***

the request for variances from the offset and open space requirements of the Code, as stated in the Staff Report and for the reasons stated in the Staff Report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Dwyer and carried unanimously.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff's recommendation was for **denial** of the request for a variance from the building height provisions of the Waukesha County Zoning Code but **approval** of the request for variances from the offset and open space requirements of the Code to allow the construction of a one and a half-story detached garage, subject to the following conditions:

1. A "preliminary site evaluation" of the proposed garage and the septic system must be conducted by the Environmental Health Division. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, evidence must be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff that the Environmental Health Division has no objection to the proposed garage, and that it meets all required minimum separation distances and would not have an adverse effect on the operation of the private waste disposal system. If that cannot be done, a sanitary permit for a new waste disposal system must be issued, and a copy furnished to the Planning and Zoning Division staff, prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit.
2. The proposed garage must be located at least 35 ft. from the east and north lot lines as proposed, as measured to the outer edges of the walls, provided the overhangs do not exceed two (2) ft. in width. If the overhangs exceed two (2) ft. in width, the building must be located so that the outer edges of the overhangs conform with the offset requirements.
3. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, a complete set of building plans, in conformance with the above conditions, must be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval.
4. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, an updated Plat of Survey showing all existing structures and the staked-out location of the proposed detached garage, in conformance with the above condition, must be prepared by a registered land surveyor and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval.
5. A detailed Grading and Drainage Plan, showing existing and proposed grades and any existing or proposed retaining walls, must be prepared by a registered landscape architect, surveyor, or engineer and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit. This is to ensure the construction of the proposed garage and retaining walls does not result in adverse drainage onto adjacent properties. The intent is that the property be graded according to the approved plan, and also to provide that the drainage remain on the property does not drain to the neighboring properties or the road. The following information must also be submitted along with the Grading and Drainage Plan: a timetable for completion, the source and type of fill, a complete vegetative plan including seeding mixtures and amount of topsoil and mulch, an erosion and sediment control plan, and the impact of any grading on stormwater and

drainage. This grading plan may be combined with the Plat of Survey required in Condition No. 4.

6. An after-the-fact Zoning Permit for the new retaining wall shall be obtained. It should be noted that retaining walls must be located a minimum of 5 ft. from the property lines unless approval has been granted by the Town of Ottawa Plan Commission and the Waukesha County Park and Planning Commission. Furthermore, if any portion of a retaining wall exceeds 4 ft. in height, a plan for the wall, stamped by a Professional Engineer or a Registered Landscape Architect, shall be submitted for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit for the wall.
7. A Declaration of Restrictions shall be prepared by the Planning and Zoning Division staff, stating that the garage shall be used for personal storage and use only and shall not be used as a rental unit, guesthouse, for any type of overnight human habitation, or for a commercial or business operation. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, the Declaration of Restrictions must be signed by the owner, notarized, and recorded in the Waukesha County Register of Deed's office, and a recorded copy furnished to the Planning and Zoning Division staff.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

A garage could be designed to meet the maximum height limitation of 25 ft. The proposed garage only exceeds the height requirement by a small amount. The personal desire of the property owner to have a taller, one and a half-story garage does not constitute a hardship and does not justify the granting of a variance from the height requirements of the Code. Therefore, it has not been demonstrated, as required for a variance, that denial of the requested variances would result in an unnecessary hardship. A hardship has been defined by the Wisconsin Supreme Court as a situation where compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome.

The property is heavily wooded and has extremely steep slopes. There is very little area on the site that is suitable for the construction of a garage. The property currently does not have a garage and the proposed detached garage will be located on the most ideal location on the site. Although the garage will be located slightly closer to the side lot line than the Code requires for an increased building height, it will still be located the minimum required offset for the Zoning District. Since the property is heavily wooded, the garage will not be visible from neighboring properties. Therefore, it is reasonable to grant a variance from the offset and open space requirements of the Code to allow the detached garage to be located in the most suitable site on the property with the least amount of additional disturbance in the environmentally sensitive areas. The approval of this request, as conditioned, will be within the purpose and intent of the Code.

BA09:038 DAVE ANSCHUETZ:

Mr. Schmidt

*I make a motion to **approve** the request, in accordance with the Staff's recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report and for the reasons stated in the Staff Report with the following modifications to the conditions recommended in the Staff Report:*

Condition No. 2 shall be modified to read as follows: "The footprint of the structures on the property shall not exceed 1,400 sq. ft. in size. The first floor of the residence shall be at least 850 sq. ft. in size and the residence shall have an attached garage that is at least 400 sq. ft. in size."

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bartholomew and carried unanimously.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff's recommendation was for **approval** of the request for variances from the road setback, offset, floor area ratio and open space requirements of the Ordinance to allow the construction of a new single-family residence with an attached garage, deck and patio on the property, subject to the following conditions:

1. The total floor area on the property shall not exceed 2,200 sq. ft. (approximately 22.3% floor area ratio). All covered decks, patios, covered porches and entryways shall be included in the total floor area.
2. The footprint of the structures on the property shall not exceed 1,300 sq. ft. in size. The first floor of the residence shall be at least 850 sq. ft. in size and the residence shall have an attached garage that is at least 400 sq. ft. in size.
3. The residence and attached garage all other appurtenances must not exceed three stories, as viewed from the lake and the road. All height requirements of the Ordinance must be complied with.
4. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, the Environmental Health Division must certify that the existing septic system is adequate for the proposed construction, or a sanitary permit for a new waste disposal system must be issued and a copy furnished to the Planning and Zoning Division staff.
5. The proposed residence and attached garage must be must be located at least 9 ft. from the edge of the road right-of-way, 7 ft. from the side lot lines, and 75 ft. from the shore and floodplain as proposed, as measured to the outer edges of the walls, provided the overhangs do not exceed two (2) ft. in width. If the overhangs exceed two (2) ft. in width, the building must be located so that the outer edges of the overhangs conform with the offset/setback requirements.
6. The proposed deck and patio must comply with the shore and floodplain setback

requirements of the Ordinance and shall be located a minimum of 6 ft. from the side lot lines.

7. Any proposed walkways or stairways on the exterior of the property shall be located a minimum of 3 ft. from the property lines.
8. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, a complete set of house plans, in conformance with the above conditions, must be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval.
9. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, a Plat of Survey showing the staked-out locations of the proposed residence, attached garage, decks, patios, walkways, etc., in conformance with the above conditions, must be prepared by a registered land surveyor and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval.
10. In order to ensure the construction of a new residence does not result in adverse drainage onto adjacent properties, a detailed Grading and Drainage Plan, showing existing and proposed grades, must be prepared by a registered landscape architect, surveyor, or engineer and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit. The intent is that the property be graded according to the approved plan, and also to provide that the drainage remain on the property or drain to the lake, and not to the neighboring properties or the road. The following information must also be submitted along with the Grading and Drainage Plan: a timetable for completion, the source and type of fill, a complete Vegetative Plan including seeding mixtures and amount of topsoil and mulch, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, and the impact of any grading on stormwater and drainage. This Grading and Drainage Plan may be combined with the Plat of Survey required in Condition No. 9.
11. No retaining walls are proposed herein. Any proposed retaining walls must comply with all Ordinance requirements.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

The approval of this request with the recommended conditions will allow the construction of a new single-family residence on the property that is reasonably sized for the lot. In 2001, the Board of Adjustment established that a 2,166 sq. ft. residence provided a reasonable use of the property. There have been no modifications to the property that justify that a larger floor area would be required to allow the property to be used for a permitted purpose. The staff has recommended a slightly increased floor area only to allow some design flexibility while limiting the footprint of the structure to slightly over the minimums required in the Ordinance.

The property itself does not meet the open space requirements of the Ordinance. Therefore, some relief is necessary from the open space requirements of the Ordinance to allow the construction of a new residence.

Variances should be granted only to provide the minimum relief necessary for a property owner to be able to use the property for a permitted purpose. The recommended structure provides this use of the property and would not be unnecessarily burdensome to the property owner. Due to the steep topography of the lot, it is necessary to construct the residence near the road so there is not a steep slope into the attached garage or a need for extreme amounts of grading and/or filling activities. The road is lightly traveled and the proposed should not obstruct vision or pose a safety hazard. Again, due to the steep topography it is appropriate to allow some relief from the offset requirement of the Ordinance to allow a residence to be more shallow so that the grade change from the front to the rear of the residence isn't as dramatic limiting the amount of grading/filling required to accommodate the new residence. Therefore, it is reasonable to grant a variance from the offset requirements of the Ordinance.

The approval of this request, as conditioned, will allow the construction of a residence and attached garage that will be appropriately sized for the lot and not detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood or contrary to the public interest. The approval of this request, as conditioned, will be within the purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

BA09:040 RICK AND MARLENE RINDERLE:

Mr. Schmidt

*I make a motion to **deny** the request, in accordance with the Staff's recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report and for the reasons stated in the Staff Report. It should be noted that the petitioners were not present. However, based on the data that they submitted, along with the application, the reasons that they set forth, and the information contained in the staff report, I don't believe that they will be able to show a hardship. They have a reasonable use of the property as it exists and they can build and office within the parameters of the Ordinance, it would just be a little smaller.*

The motion was seconded by Ms. Bonniwell and carried unanimously.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff's recommendation was for **denial** of the request for a variance from the floor area ratio requirement of the Waukesha County Zoning Code ordinance for the proposed addition.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

It has not been demonstrated, as required for a variance, that denial of the requested variance would result in an unnecessary hardship. A hardship has been defined by the Wisconsin Supreme Court as a situation where compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that there are unique physical conditions on the property which prevent compliance with the Ordinance.

The lot is conforming and the existing residence is in a conforming location on the lot. Although the addition may not have an impact on the neighboring properties or on the open space of the property, the property is currently being used for a permitted purpose. The proposed addition would be for the convenience of the owner only and is not necessary to use the property for a permitted purpose. Therefore, the approval of this request would not be within the purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

BA09:041 KATHARINA HAZOD:

Mr. Dwyer

I make a motion to deny the request for a shore setback variance but approve the request for variances from the private road setback, floodplain setback and conservancy setback requirements of the Ordinance, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The residence, attached garage, and all other appurtenances such as decks or patios, must be located a minimum of 10 ft. from the original private road easement, 75 ft. from the ordinary high water mark, and 3 ft. above the elevation of the 100-year floodplain/conservancy boundary, as measured to the outer edges of the walls, provided the overhangs do not exceed 2 ft. in width. If the overhangs exceed 2 ft. in width, the building must be located so that the outer edges of the overhangs conform with the setback requirements.*
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, a Certified Survey Map combining the four existing parcels into one parcel must be recorded in the Waukesha County Register of Deeds Office and a copy furnished to the Waukesha County Planning and Zoning Division Staff. The Certified Survey Map shall contain the condition that the lots on either side of the road may not be sold separately.*
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, documentation shall be submitted to the Waukesha County Planning and Zoning Division Staff that either the relocated private road easement has been properly rescinded or has been approved by the Town of Ottawa and Waukesha County.*
- 4. The residence and attached garage must not exceed three stories as viewed from the lake and shall comply with all other height requirements of the Ordinance.*
- 5. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, the Waukesha County Environmental Health Division must certify that the existing*

septic system is adequate for the proposed construction, or a Sanitary Permit for a new waste disposal system must be issued and a copy furnished to the Planning and Zoning Division Staff.

- 6. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, a complete set of house plans, in conformance with the above conditions, must be submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division Staff for review and approval.*
- 7. Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit, a Plat of Survey showing the staked-out location of the proposed residence, attached garage, decks, patios, walkways, etc., in conformance with the above conditions, must be prepared by a registered land surveyor and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval.*
- 8. In order to ensure the construction of a new residence does not result in adverse drainage onto adjacent properties, a detailed Grading and Drainage Plan, showing existing and proposed grades and any proposed retaining walls, must be prepared by a registered landscape architect, surveyor, or engineer and submitted to the Planning and Zoning Division staff for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit. The intent is that the property be graded according to the approved plan, and also to provide that the drainage remain on the property or drain to the lake, and not to the neighboring properties or the road. The following information must also be submitted along with the Grading and Drainage Plan: a timetable for completion, the source and type of fill, a complete vegetative plan including seeding mixtures and amount of topsoil and mulch, an erosion and sediment control plan, and the impact of any grading on stormwater and drainage. This Grading and Drainage Plan may be combined with the Plat of Survey required in Condition No.7.*
- 9. No disturbance shall be allowed within the 100-year floodplain.*
- 10. No retaining walls are proposed herein. Any proposed retaining walls must comply with all Ordinance requirements.*

Thereasons for the motion are as follows:

The combination of the steep slope, the location of the private road, and the relocated road agreed to by all the residents, all constitute a hardship in trying to reasonably build on the property. The approval of this request as conditioned will not be a public nuisance or a

hazard to the public safety and welfare.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Bonniwell and carried unanimously.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff's recommendation was for **denial** of the request for variances from the private road setback, shore setback, floodplain setback, and conservancy setback requirements for the construction of a new residence with an attached garage and appurtenances.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

The law requires that the petitioner demonstrate that conformance with Ordinance requirements would prevent them from using the property for a permitted purpose or whether conformance with the restrictions would be unnecessarily burdensome on them. The law further provides that variances are intended to provide only the minimum amount of relief necessary to allow a reasonable use of the property. In this case, the owners have several different options that may be utilized to allow them to have a very reasonable use of the property and avoid the need for variances. The hardships identified by the owner are financial in nature or are due to a personal preference of the property owner. The law indicates that hardships should not be financial or economic in nature and that the personal circumstances of the property should not be used to determine if variances should be granted.

The owner would have the following options to construct a reasonably sized residence on the property without the need for variances:

1. Leave the existing private roadway and utilities in their current locations and build a residence on the west side of the private road. Without variances, this portion of the property would provide a building envelope of approximately 185 ft. wide by 80 ft. and would allow the residence to be constructed on the inside curve of the road. It should be noted that if the owner chooses this option, the recorded roadway relocation document will need to be formally rescinded.
2. Relocate the existing private road and utilities and build a residence on the east side (lakeside) of the private road. Without variances, this would provide a building envelope of approximately 140 ft. wide by 100 ft. deep. It should be noted that if the owner chooses this option, the recorded roadway relocation document may need to be revised to obtain the approval of the Town of Ottawa and Waukesha County in conjunction with a revised Certified Survey Map.

Because these options exist, it has not been demonstrated, as required for a variance, that denial of the requested variances would result in an unnecessary hardship. A hardship has been defined by the Wisconsin Supreme Court as a situation where compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk or density would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome.

Although moving the road and utility lines may be a more expensive option, there is a building envelope on the property with the road and utility lines in their current locations. The law indicates that variances should only be granted to provide the minimum amount of relief necessary to allow a property to be used for a permitted purpose. It does not indicate that variances should be granted to allow the highest and best use of the property. Therefore, since there is a building envelope on the property, there is no justification for the granting of variances. If the owner desires to build a residence in an area other than the conforming building envelope, the burden should fall to the owner to make it work without variances.

When considering whether variances are appropriate to allow the construction of a residence on the lakeside of the roadway in its current location, the Board should also consider the amount of land disturbance activities that building on such a steep slope would require, the potential impact on the existing swale on the south side of the property, and the safety hazard that may result from the construction of a structure so close to the outside curve of the roadway. It is for the reasons stated above that the approval of this request would not be within the purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

BA09:042 WILLIAM DURKIN:

Ms. Bonniwell

I move that the Board find that the keeping of bees for non-commercial purposes does not meet the definition of “general farming” under the Ordinance. The Ordinance, as written, has no definition of “general farming.” The Ordinance is generally vague and it would be arbitrary to apply the definition of “general farming” to the keeping of two beehives for hobby and personal use.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bartholomew and carried unanimously.

The Planning and Zoning Division staff’s recommendation was to **uphold** the staff determination that beekeeping is considered “general farming” and is not allowed in the R-1 zoning district on lots less than 5 acres in size.

The reasons for the recommendation, as stated in the Staff Report, are as follows:

Based on the nature of the activity and the potential for detrimental impacts on the neighboring properties, it is reasonable to consider beekeeping activities as “general farming.” This property is a residential lot in an area of numerous other residential properties of a similar size and shape. While bees, if undisturbed are usually not aggressive, this area of residential use has the potential to result in bees becoming more aggressive and having detrimental effects on surrounding neighbors. This type of use should be encouraged in the less dense, more rural areas of the County. Therefore, the staff determination is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING BOARD ACTION: None

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Bartholomew *I make a motion to adjourn this meeting at 10:16 p.m.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmidt and carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy M. Bonniwell
Secretary, Board of Adjustment